

St. John's Law Review

Volume 43
Number 1 *Volume 43, July 1968, Number 1*

Article 28

December 2012

CPLR 5201: Future Rents Not Subject to Attachment

St. John's Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview>

Recommended Citation

St. John's Law Review (1968) "CPLR 5201: Future Rents Not Subject to Attachment," *St. John's Law Review*: Vol. 43 : No. 1 , Article 28.

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol43/iss1/28>

This Recent Development in New York Law is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in St. John's Law Review by an authorized editor of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact selbyc@stjohns.edu.

ARTICLE 52 — ENFORCEMENT OF MONEY JUDGMENTS *

CPLR 5201: *Future rents not subject to attachment.*

CPLR 5201 provides in part that a money judgment can be enforced against a debt when the debt is certain to become due.

In *Glassman v. Hyder*,¹²⁷ plaintiff attached the future rents payable to defendant under a long-term lease. The appellate division, first department, reversing appellate term,¹²⁸ held that rents not yet due are contingent and, therefore, are not attachable as debts to become due "certainly or upon demand."

It is apparent that whether the landlord will receive the rent from a tenant is contingent; dependent upon both parties' abiding by the terms of the contract of lease. If the landlord breaches the contract, the tenant may be released from paying rent. If the entire amount of the rent receipts could be attached, the probability that the landlord will breach the contract is increased, *i.e.*, he will have less money to fulfill his contractual obligations of making repairs, supplying heat, etc.

Thus the instant case appears to be a logical interpretation of CPLR 5201 and is in conformity with prior law.¹²⁹

ARTICLE 55 — APPEALS GENERALLY

CPLR 5522: *Intervening decision of United States Supreme Court will not upset a "final" decision.*

In *In re Huie*,¹³⁰ claimant made a motion for reargument of an earlier decided motion for which the statutory time for appeal had expired. The trial court nevertheless granted the motion because a decision of the United States Supreme Court,¹³¹ in the interim, indicated that claimant's prior motion was erroneously dismissed. The Court of Appeals, in affirming the appellate division's reversal of the lower court's order, held that in the absence of the special circumstances enumerated in CPLR 5015, *e.g.*, the discovery of new evidence, fraud, or lack of jurisdiction, a determination which is not appealed should remain undisturbed.

* For a discussion of the latest developments on the "Seider" front see the student note in this issue.

¹²⁷ 28 App. Div. 2d 974, 283 N.Y.S.2d 419 (1st Dep't 1967).

¹²⁸ For a discussion and criticism of the appellate term's decision see *The Quarterly Survey of New York Practice*, 42 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 128, 157 (1967).

¹²⁹ *In re Ryan*, 294 N.Y. 85, 60 N.E.2d 817 (1945). *But cf.* *Seider v. Roth*, 17 N.Y.2d 111, 216 N.E.2d 312, 269 N.Y.S.2d 99 (1966).

¹³⁰ 20 N.Y.2d 568, 232 N.E.2d 642, 285 N.Y.S.2d 610 (1967).

¹³¹ The intervening case which precipitated this confusion was *Schroeder v. City of New York*, 371 U.S. 208 (1962).